

Recent verifications of a new relativity principle and a new gravitational theory based on properties of light

Rafael A. Vera*

Departamento de Física.

Facultad de Ciencias Físicas y Matemáticas.

Universidad de Concepción. Concepcion.

Chile.

Abstract

Recent astronomical observations verify the new scenario resulting from new conservation laws and a new relativity principle fixed either by dual properties of light or by new gravitational (G) tests and the Einstein's equivalence principle. This scenario is radically different from the classical one. During a free fall, the relative masses of free bodies, with respect to the observer at rest in a G field, remain constants. The energy released during the stops in different G potentials (GP) comes not from the G field but from the bodies. The relative properties of the bodies at rest with respect to the observer depend on the differences of GP between the bodies and the observer. The increase of GP due to universe expansion expands bodies in identical proportion. The universe age may be infinite. Its entropy is conserved because the new black hole, without singularity, after absorbing radiation, explodes regenerating new gas that transforms dark galaxies into luminous ones. Galaxies evolve, indefinitely in closed cycles with luminous and dark periods. All of their phases are found anywhere in the universe. They solve fundamental dilemmas like dark matter and radiation backgrounds

*rvera@udec.cl

I. INTRODUCTION

In the Einstein's Centennial Symposium on Fundamental Physics (Bogotá, 1979), the dual properties of light have been used as a crucial test for gravitational (G) theories [1]. Thus it is proved, according to wave continuity, that the relative frequency of an electromagnetic wave-train traveling in a static G field, with respect to any well-defined observer at rest the field, must be conserved¹. This new "conservation law" is in clear contradiction with the Einstein's G field energy hypothesis (GFEH) according to which the photons would change their frequencies, during their trips, due to a hypothetical energy exchange with the G field.

This new law has been generalized for bodies on the base of "*a new theory based on a particle model made up of photons in stationary states*" [2]. This model is justified from the fact that, "according to the Einstein's equivalence principle (EEP), all of the well-defined parts of a system that must obey the same inertial and gravitational laws". Since the minimum well-defined part of a system is a photon in stationary state between other well-defined parts of the same system, then such photon must have the same inertial and gravitational properties of the other parts of such system. Then in principle *the inertial and gravitational properties of bodies can be derived, independently on the traditional hypotheses, by using a particle model made up of a photon in stationary state.*

Effectively, so far, the relative properties of such model, derived theoretically, do correspond with special relativity (SR), quantum mechanics and with all of the classical tests for G theories [2], [3]. They can be summarized into a new "*relative mass-energy conservation law*" and "*a non-equivalence principle*" (NEP) *for bodies in different GP*. According to them, the relative mass-energy and the relative frequencies of a body (or a photon) traveling freely in a G field, with respect to any observer at rest in a constant GP, remain constants. If the body stops in different G potentials it releases, locally, different energies, and, therefore, its final relative properties are linearly dependent on its corresponding difference of GP with respect to the observer.

¹From wave continuity, during the trip, *the number N of waves between any two waves of a wave train is conserved.* On the other hand, *each wave takes the same time interval, of a clock of constant frequency, to travel between any two points A and B of a static G field.* Then the relative frequency of the waves crossing the point B with respect to the clock of the observer at A is identical to the frequency of the waves crossing the point A, with respect to the same clock

The proportional differences of frequencies, mass-energies and lengths of the NL body, compared with the local ones, at the observer's potential, are just equal to their respective differences of GP.

The NEP has been successfully tested with all of the classical tests for G theories [1] [2]. Below, it has been directly verified, independently on the particle model, from a new test based on the condition of consistency of the EEP with the results of genuine GTD experiments that don't depend on the frequency of any photons traveling between the clocks. Further verifications come from the agreement of the new astrophysical context predicted from such principle and some recent astronomical observations.

II. A NEW TEST FOR THE NEW PRINCIPLE

From the results of the genuine GTD experiments it is concluded that “*the proportional differences of frequency of the standard clocks at rest in different GP are just equal to the differences of GP between them*”. Then, to describe the real physical differences of a non-local (NL) clock at some NL position B with respect to some observer in a position A, a new formalism must be used in which the positions A and B must be clearly stated. Here, and in the works cited above, the observer's position, which is most important, has been indicated by a subscript. Thus the results of GTD experiments, reduced to static conditions, can be stated in the form:

$$\frac{\nu_A(0, B) - \nu_A(0, A)}{\nu_A(0, A)} = \Delta\phi_A(B) = \frac{\Delta E_A(B)}{m_A(0, A)} \quad (1)$$

The first member is called “*the proportional difference of frequency of the NL clock at B with respect to the (local) clock at A*”. This one turns out to be just equal to the difference of GP between B and A, called $\Delta\phi_A(B)$, which is defined in (1) as the proportional energy released by the clock, or any other small test body, after a free fall from B and a stop at A, compared with its local rest mass-energy at A. Notice that the masses and the energies are expressed in energy units.

From (1), the clock at B is physically different compared with the clock at A, i.e., the CH is wrong.

Then the NEP can be directly derived from the general condition of correspondence of (1) with the EEP. For such purpose, let $\nu_A(0, A)$, $m_A(0, A)$ and $\lambda_A(0, A)$ be the generic symbols for the “*local*” values of any frequency,

mass-energy, length or wavelength, respectively, of any isolated part or photon in stationary state of a system at rest at A, with respect to the observer at rest at A. From the EEP, such values are related to each other by constants that don't depend on the differences GP of the local system with respect to other systems.

$$\nu_A(0, A) : m_A(0, A) : \lambda_A(0, A) = C1 : C2 : C3 \quad (2)$$

Then (1) can be consistent with (2) only if:

$$\frac{\Delta\nu_A(0, B)}{\nu_A(0, A)} = \frac{\Delta m_A(0, B)}{m_A(0, A)} = \frac{\Delta\lambda_A(0, B)}{\lambda_A(0, A)} = \Delta\phi_A(B) \quad (3)$$

In which $\Delta\nu_A(0, B) = \nu_A(0, B) - \nu_A(0, A)$

From (3), the proportional differences of the basic properties of standard bodies at rest at B with respect to the observer at A, are just equal to the difference of GP between B and A.

This is a direct verification of the NEP originally derived, step by step, from properties of light[1],[2].

Notice that the NEP is more general than the EEP because it is also valid for NL cases in which bodies and observers are in different GP. Obviously, it corresponds with the EEP in any local case in which the difference of GP between the NL object and the observer tends to zero.

To the contrary of the EEP, the NEP shows that some real (absolute) physical differences exist between standard bodies in different GP, i.e., that the CH is wrong. Then *the current relationships between quantities measured by observers at rest in different GP are inhomogeneous because their reference standards are physically different compared to each other*².

From the 2nd and the last member of (3):

$$\Delta E_A(B) = \Delta m_A(0, B) = m_A(0, B) - m_A(0, A) \quad (4)$$

The energy released during G work comes not from the G field but from the transformation of a fraction of the mass of a body into free energy.

²This turns out to be the source of most of the problems in gravitation, astrophysics and cosmology, as shown below

For example, during a free fall from B to A, special relativity can be applied locally at A, just before the stop at A. If $m_A(V, A)$ is the relativistic mass of the moving body with respect to the observer at A, then:

$$\Delta E_A(B) = m_A(V, B) - m_A(0, A) \quad (5)$$

From (4) and (5),

$$m_A(V, A) - m_A(0, B) \quad (6)$$

During a free fall, the relativistic mass of a NL body, with respect to an observer at rest in a well-defined potential, remains constant. This is just the relative mass-energy conservation law for NL bodies with respect to inertial observers at rest in some well-defined GP. Then, to the contrary of GR, the G field does not exchange energy with bodies and photons.

A. Gravity is a Refraction Phenomenon

If $\nu_A(0, B)$ is the relative frequency of a standing electromagnetic wave of a system at rest at B, with respect to the observer at A, and if $\lambda_A(0, B)$ is its relative wavelength, then the relative speed of NL light at B with respect to the observer at A is:

$$c_A(B) = \nu_A(0, B)\lambda_A(0, B) \quad (7)$$

Then, from (3) and (7),

$$\frac{\Delta \nu_A(0, B)}{\nu_A(0, A)} = \frac{\Delta \lambda_A(0, B)}{\lambda_A(0, A)} = \frac{\Delta c_A(B)}{2c_A(B)} = \Delta \phi_A(B) \quad (8)$$

From (8) it is clear that the G field is a gradient of the relative refraction index of the NL space with respect to observers in a fixed GP, i.e., *that gravitation is a refraction phenomenon due to a gradient of the relative speed of light*. This is obvious, anyway, in the *G lens effect*.

Notice that this is a self-consistency test for the new theory because in any refraction phenomenon there is a momentum exchange without energy exchange between the photons and the dielectric. Thus the refraction occurring during the round trips of the model's standing waves accounts for both the momentum exchange and the lack of energy exchange between the bodies and radiations and the G field.

B. Discussion

According to the CH, the relative mass of a body at rest with respect to the observer would be independent on the difference of GP between the body and the observer. Thus the CH rules out the possibility that bodies can give up the energy released after a change of GP. Then *a reason for which general relativity (GR) accounts for the classical tests for G theories is that the proportional errors of the CH are compensated by those of the GFEH introduced by Einstein.* But this happens only when the two hypotheses are used. The real errors of each hypothesis do stand out when just one of them is used.

For example, GR accounts for the results of experiments on G red shift (GRS) in which it is tacitly assumed that the relative emission frequency of the standard atoms located in different GP are the same with respect to each other, which is the CH. At the same time it is assumed that, during the trip of the photons, their frequencies would change due to some hypothetical energy exchange between the photons and the G field, which is the GFEH. Thus the errors of the two hypotheses, of the same magnitude and opposite signs, are exactly compensated.

On the other hand, from just wave continuity, the GFEH is necessarily wrong. The same holds for the CH because, from just GTD experiments, the relative frequencies of the standard clocks in different GP are different with respect to each other. Such differences existed *before* any photon can travel between the clocks.

The referee of an important journal of physics has argued that: in a GTD experiment, the two clocks located in different GP should run with the same frequency because a photon traveling between the clocks would be red shifted during its trip due to the work done by the G field. Obviously, he did not realize in that the results of such experiments don't depend on the frequency of any photon traveling between the clocks. Anyway, such argument is equivalent to say that the CH should be true just because the GFEH should be true, i.e., that the first hypothesis of GR should be true just because the second hypothesis of GR should be true. This is a clear vicious circle. The point here is that each of these two hypotheses is wrong.

III. THE NEW UNIVERSE FIXED BY THE NEP

In the standard cosmology it is assumed that the measurement rods would not expand after the increase of GP coming from universe expansion. Such hypothesis is in contradiction with the phenomenon of “gravitational expansion” fixed by (8).

It may be argued that the strong forces within the structure of particles would prevent such expansion. This is not true because (8) comes from the EEP and experiments whose results are independent on the existence of such forces.

Assume, as a “*trial hypothesis*”, that bodies don’t expand during universe expansion. Thus, after a time interval Δt , the proportional increase of every relative distance in the universe, with respect to the observer, would be the same and equal to $H\Delta t$. Then it is simple to find that the proportional increase of GP at the observer’s place would be,

$$\Delta\phi = \frac{\Delta r}{r} = H\Delta t \quad (9)$$

From (3), (9), the proportional expansion of a body is:

$$\frac{\Delta\lambda}{\lambda} = \Delta\phi = \frac{\Delta r}{r} = H\Delta t \quad (10)$$

Thus the “trial hypothesis” is wrong because it is not possible to find a real reference standard, or reference frame, that does not expand in just the same proportion as any other distance of the universe. Thus, paradoxically, a global universe expansion cannot increase any measured distance, velocity or cosmological red shift because matter must expand in just the same proportion. From the relative (measurable) viewpoint, the average universe must look like it was static, for ever, i.e., its age can be infinite.

On the other hand, from the “relative mass-energy conservation law”, the relative mass-energies would also be conserved during a universe expansion. Anyway, this is obvious from the lack of real energy exchange between the space and the free bodies.

The same conclusion comes out, even more obviously, after emulating every part of the universe by particle models made up of photons in stationary states. Then it is found, from the Huygens’s principle, that the photons and particles would be the result of constructive interferences of wavelets that

are traveling rather indefinitely in the universe. Thus a universe expansion would stretch every wavelet in just the same proportion, which would not change any ratio between its parts³.

A. The New Kind of Black Hole

The strict linearity of the new equations eliminates the odd singularity produced by the non linear equations of GR. Thus the new kind of “linear black hole” (LBH) is just a huge “macronucleus” that *obeys ordinary nuclear laws* [1], [2], [3]. From (8), due to the very low relative speed of light, the relative mass of its nucleons must be very low compared with the ones far away from the LBH.

The high gradient of the relative refraction index of the space around the LBH would prevent the escape of individual photons and nucleons, after the phenomenon of critical reflection. On the other hand such gradient would increase its cross section for capturing radiation coming from all over the universe.

Then the average mass-energy per neutron in the LBH, with respect to an observer at infinite, must increase with the time until it becomes equal to the mass of a free neutron far away from it. This is equivalent to hot plasma confined in a small volume, by its own G field. In such critical state the LBH can decay, rather adiabatically, thus generating a new primeval gas of composition similar to that predicted for the hot *Big-Bang* theory. This gas can start a new evolution cycle of matter within a small volume of the universe, like a galaxy.

B. Evolution Cycles of the Galaxies

From the new properties of the black holes and from the longer age of the universe it is inferred that, in one way or another, an appreciable fraction of the matter in a galaxy must be evolving in rather closed cycles between the states of gas and LBH and vice versa.

In the long run, a galaxy, after radiation emission, must end as a “*dark galaxy*” made up of one or a couple of LBH surrounded by a set of dead stars, planets and planetesimals, in a space rather free of plasmas. Such galaxy

³Notice that the “wavelets” turn out to be most important for a simplified and unified understanding a wide range of phenomena occurring in the universe.

cannot collapse because their uncharged bodies cannot emit gravitons⁴. After an out gassing period, and after a long period of radiation absorption, its LBH should explode, in chain, thus generating new primeval gas that can transform the dark galaxy into a luminous one.

Thus a galaxy should evolve in rather closed cycles, with luminous and dark periods, rather indefinitely. Its luminous periods must end when the whole galaxy has run out of available energies. The dark periods would end when the LBH has absorbed energy enough to explode

C. The New Model of Star Formation

In the new scenario, the primordial gas comes not from a universal Big-Bang but from LBH explosions occurring mostly in the central regions of dark galaxies. Most of this gas would be absorbed by the cool bodies of the dark galaxy. The evolution states of the new luminous bodies must also depend on the evolution states of the dark bodies from which they come from.

Then this new scenario accounts for the existence, within the same galaxy, of two main kinds of stars in different evolution states: the really “new” stars coming gas captured by low mass bodies such as planets and planetesimals of the dark period, and the “renewed” stars coming from gas captured by dead stars or neutron stars of the same dark period. Thus, strictly, the last ones are older than the first ones. The new stars should have low densities and low temperatures, and the last ones would have higher densities and higher temperatures. Paradoxically, the properties of the “new” stars correspond with the so called “old” stars. Those of the “renewed” ones correspond with the so called “young” stars.

Notice that a renewed star can also be formed from gas compressed by the strong G field gradient of an earlier “neutron star”. Since the G binding energy of the neutrons can be of a higher order of magnitude than the nuclear one, and then in principle such star should show higher temperatures (bluer) than the original stars where it comes from. Thus a neutron star is likely to be growing up rather hidden in the center of some bluer stars of the new

⁴This is not the case of binary pulsars in which there is plasma falling in combination of magnetic and G fields that transforms G energy into electric energy. These charged bodies do radiate “photons” that would take away angular momentum thus making believe in that they are “gravitons”. So far the experiments for detecting gravitons have failed.

galaxy.

In principle, a naked neutron star can react with the ions falling on it, mainly along magnetic lines, according to “neutron stripping reactions”. Due to the higher G binding energy of the neutrons, the protons must be rejected along its magnetic axis. They would normally be stopped by the external gas shell. For thin shells, they can pass through them, which would account for the “cosmic jets” that in turn would become sources of radio waves. They account for the low proportion of neutrons in the “cosmic rays”.

Then the direct fall of matter on naked neutron stars should also produce high energy radiation like cosmic rays, variable X-rays and gamma bursts. The continuous fall of plasma on a super massive neutron star, in a very low GP, would produce a star-like object of high G red shift that can be misinterpreted as a cosmological red shift. They would correspond with the so called *quasi stellar radio sources, i.e., quasars*.

D. The New Model of Galaxy Evolution

A luminous period of a galaxy should start after a chain of LBH explosions occurring in a dark galaxy. The dark bodies, after absorbing new gas, would form two main sets of stars: the strictly “new” stars, most of them with random angular momentum orientations, and a small number of “renewed” stars with higher proportions of preferred angular momentum orientations that come from the dark period. Thus the new galaxy, of a rather spherical shape, would correspond with “elliptical galaxies” that have maximum proportions of new gas and minimum proportion of metal contamination and dark bodies.

During its luminous period the renewed stars can capture gas clouds and steal gas from near stars of lower densities. In the long run, they may become more powerful stars while the other less massive stars may become dark ones. Thus, in the average, the renewed stars may stay luminous longer than the lower density stars. They must show up the higher proportion of the preferred orientation of such kind of stars. Thus the luminous volume of the elliptical galaxy should take the form of a disk, or a spiral, surrounded by a rather spherical halo of dark bodies.

In the meanwhile, the more dense and massive stars should drift towards the center of the galaxy, in counter current with lower mass stars. They must grow in mass by capturing gas and other lower mass bodies. Thus, a

cluster of massive neutron stars should grow up in the central region of the galaxy. They should become sources of high energy radiations coming from nuclear-gravitational reactions. Thus the spiral galaxy should turn into an AGN.

In the long run, the central cluster of neutron stars should be reduced to a single super massive LBH, or a binary one. This one would be a star-like object that would be still capturing recycled gas of the galaxy. It would be surrounded by a shell of hot plasma supported its magnetic field. Due to its low GP, with respect to the observer, it should emit light with a high G red shift. The fall of positive ions along its polar regions would produce narrow jets of high energy protons (*cosmic rays*) along the magnetic axis, according to nuclear stripping reactions, which would become source of *radio waves*. This star-like object is consistent with the genuine quasi stellar radio sources (quasars) of high red shift.

During the dark period of a galaxy, after an out gassing period, the uncharged bodies cannot loose the presumed gravitons because they don't exchange energy with G fields. This property would prevent the collapse of the dark galaxy. Thus, after a long period of radiation absorption, the nucleons of its most massive LBH can reach the critical relative mass after which it may explode thus starting a new galaxy cycle.

Since the universe age would be rather infinite, then, statistically, *“the different evolution phases of the galaxies and clusters should be rather uniformly distributed in the universe in the proportions fixed by the periods of their corresponding phases”*.

Due to the small average energy absorption rate of a dark galaxy, compared with the high emission rate in its luminous period, the dark period necessary for recovering the energy lost during the luminous period must be of a higher order of magnitude than the luminous period. Then, statistically, the average proportion of dark galaxies, compared with the luminous ones, must also be a high number, i.e., “most of the galaxies of the universe should be in their cool periods”. They should account for the low temperature blackbody radiation observed in the CMB.

Since the energy recovery period of a galaxy greatly depends on the luminosities of its closest neighbors, then the sudden increase of energy emitted by one of them should accelerate (trigger) the explosion of the other ones. Thus the regeneration of clusters can occur in “chains” that are consistent with the clusters of luminous galaxies. The clusters of dark galaxies are

consistent with the apparent “voids” in the universe.

IV. SOME RECENT ASTRONOMICAL VERIFICATIONS

A. Galaxies without Dark Matter

From above, *the minimum proportion of dark bodies should exist in the recently formed elliptical galaxies*. This fact has been recently verified by Romanowsky [4]. From his studies of the kinematics of the outer parts of three intermediate-luminosity elliptical galaxies, he found that “the data indicates the presence of little if any dark matter in these galaxies”. “This unexpected result conflicts with findings in other galaxy types and poses a challenge to current galaxy formation theories”.

B. Dark Matter Haloes around Galaxies

During the lifetime of a new galaxy, the halo of dead stars should increase until the whole galaxy is dark. Thus the x-ray halo coming from hot gas trapped between the dark bodies can put into relief the existence of such bodies.

This is consistent with the x-ray halos found around galaxies [5]. The rather “spherical” halo observed around some non-spherical galaxies puts into relief that the original galaxy was an elliptical one. Thus the proportion of dark bodies increases with the “relative” age of a galaxy. This accounts for the increase of the proportion of dark matter and the increase of the central density for dwarf galaxies of smaller luminous volumes [6].

C. Renewed Stars in New Galaxies

In the new scenario, the “renewed stars”, that come from gas captured by dead stars of the dark period, should become denser and more powerful than the stars where they come from. They may show some original contamination from metals formed in the earlier luminous period of the same galaxy, which would increase with the time. Thus, paradoxically, the “renewed stars”, would correspond with the so called “young stars” of the current literature and the “new stars” correspond with the “old stars”. Thus “the renewed

stars in new galaxies” do correspond with the so called “young stars in old galaxies” [7]. Thus the terms “old” and “young” turn out to be rather ambiguous and misleading. Here, for this reason, they have been replaced by “new” and “renewed”, respectively .

D. New Galaxies in an Old (Renewed) Universe

From above, all of the phases of the cyclical evolution of the galaxies should be present in the sky, anywhere and in any time. They correspond with recent deep field observations, called “*Old Galaxies in the Young Universe*”.

Schade *et al*, for example, have found massive elliptical galaxies between 8 and 11 billion years ago [8]. “*There is no evidence for a decline in the space density of early-type galaxies with look-back time*”. According to the conventional (hierarchical) model, elliptical galaxies would be the *oldest* ones and, therefore, they could not exist at near the presumed beginning of the universe.

D. Schwartz and S. Virani, after observing the quasar SDSSp J1306 at 12.7 billion light years, they found that “*its X-ray spectrum is indistinguishable from that of nearby, older quasars*”. “*Likewise, its relative brightness at optical and X-ray wavelengths was similar to that of the nearby group of quasars*” [9].

D. Farrah et al found that the QSO SDSS J1030, at 12.8 billion light years, “*appears indistinguishable in any way from lower red shift QSOs, indicating that QSOs comparable to those seen locally existed less than 1 Gyr after the (presumed) big bang*” [10].

Since elliptical galaxies and quasars of high redshifts would be the initial and the final luminous phases of the galaxies, then similar results are expected for the intermediate phases.

E. The Last Luminous Regions of Galaxies

Recent astronomical observations clearly show that massive black-holes and quasars of high red shift are close to the center of galaxies of much lower red shifts. Obviously, the high difference of red shift is gravitational one [11]. This would prove that quasars or high redshifts are just the boundaries of LBH in the central regions of the last luminous regions of galaxies.

Near the end of the luminous phase of a galaxy, most of the remaining interstellar plasma of the host dark galaxy should become cool enough to absorb the high energy radiation emitted by the small quasar. This is consistent with “*the paucity of ultraviolet light and higher frequencies in quasars of red shifts higher than 6.3*” [12].

After that, for a short period, *the new dark galaxy* could be detected from the radiation emitted by residual gas, before it is completely out gassed by its cool bodies. This is consistent with *the two isolated H I clouds recently found in Virgo* [13].

F. G Time Dilation of Supernovas

From the NEP, the proportional differences of the relative frequency of the atoms and of any natural phenomenon that may occur in a NL galaxy, due either to differences of velocity or due to differences of GP, compared to those of local galaxies, should be the same. This has been verified by Goldhaber et al from the identical proportion of the GTD observed in the light curves of supernovas and of the emission frequency of their atoms [13].

V. CONCLUSIONS

A direct test of the NEP comes out from the general correspondence of the EEP with the results of the genuine GTD experiments done with standard clocks. This one puts into relief that the original source of the current problems and errors in physics and cosmology is the CH.

The success of GR comes from the fact that the errors of the GFEH, introduced by Einstein, are of the same magnitude and opposite sign than the errors of the CH. Thus, *in the classical tests of GR, the two kinds of errors are just compensated*, which makes believe in that everything is OK, which is not true. Because this happens only when the two hypotheses are used. *The errors stand out when only one of such hypothesis is used.*

The elimination of the two hypotheses bring out clear simplifications, because the G field has no energy and, therefore, there is not energy exchange between the G field a body traveling freely in a G field and during universe expansion. During its free trip, its relative mass, with respect to any inertial observer, remains constant. The real changes do occur when the body stops in different GP thus releasing different energies. The proportional differences

of the relative rest masses are just equal to the corresponding differences of GP.

Then the true reasons for the EEP and for the constant speed of light become clearer because the real changes occurring after changes of GP or velocity cannot be detected by observers that have had the same changes of GP or of velocity. This is because all of the well-defined part of a systems have the same nature and, therefore, they changed in identical proportion. Then every local ratio remains unchanged, which makes believe in that nothing has happened, which is not strictly true.

The new astrophysical scenario fixed by the NEP is also a good test for the new theory because it has radical differences compared with the standard scenario, mainly in that the universe expansion cannot produce measurable changes with the time. Thus the average universe must look like it was static, i.e., its age may be infinite.

The new kind of “*linear*” black hole, without singularity, plays an important role for the global conservations of the mass-energy and of the entropy in this universe. It concentrates the dispersed radiation into a macronucleus that, after a long period, can explode thus generating “new primeval gas” that can transform a dead galaxy into a luminous one and so on, i.e., it makes possible that matter can evolve, indefinitely, in rather closed cycles.

Then the galaxies should have been evolving, from long time ago, in rather closed cycles with luminous and dark periods. Only in this way, statistically, the different phases of the evolution cycles of the galaxies can be present in the universe, in the proportion given by their corresponding periods. The average relative properties of the bodies in the universe, like their mass-energies, densities and entropies would remain constants with the time.

Recent astronomical observations clearly verify the existence of all of the different phases of the galaxy cycles predicted from the NEP, within a wide region of space-time, up to near the presumed birth of the universe. They are in clear contradiction with the current hypotheses used for interpreting the astronomical observations.

Regardless of its high simplicity, the new theory based on properties of light unifies concepts in several branches of physics, mainly in gravitation, nuclear physics, quantum mechanics and astrophysics. Thus it should be considered as a serious alternative for understanding the physical phenomena occurring in the universe.

References

- ¹R. A. Vera, “What does the work in a G field?”, Proceedings of the Einstein’s Centennial Symposium on Fundamental Physics, Eds. S. M. Moore (Universidad de Los Andes, Bogotá) and G. Violini (Università di Roma), pp. 597-625, 1981.
- ²R. A. Vera, “A Dilemma in the Physics of G Fields”, International Journal of Th. Physics, 20, pp. 19-50, 1981.
- ³R. A. Vera, “The New Universe Fixed by the EEP and Properties of Light”, Eds. de la Universidad de Concepcion. Chile <rvera@udec.cl>, 1997
- ⁴A. J. Romanowsky *et al*, “A Dearth of Dark Matter in Ordinary Elliptical Galaxies”, Science, 301 Issue 5640, pp. 1696-1698, 2003.
- ⁵D. Buote *et al*, “Chandra Evidence for a Flattened, Triaxial Dark Matter Halo in the Elliptical Galaxy NGC 720”, Astrophys. J. 577, 183
- ⁶J. Kormendy, K. C. Freeman, “Scaling Laws for D. Matter Halos in Late Type and Dwarf Spheroid Galaxies”, Bull. A. A. S., 30, 1281, 1998
- ⁷A. Cimatti *et al*, “Old galaxies in the young Universe”. Nature 430, 184 - 187 (08 July 2004)
- ⁸David Schade, “HST Imaging of the CFRS and LDSS Red shift Surveys-III. Field elliptical galaxies at $0.2 < z < 1.0$ ”, ArXiv: astro-ph/9906171.
- ⁹D. A. Schwartz and S. N. Virani, “Chandra Measurement of the X-Ray Spectrum of a Quasar at $z = 5.99$ ”, ApJL, 615, L21, 2004. [10] D. Farrah *et al*, “The X-Ray Spectrum of the $z = 6.30$ QSO SDSS J1030+0524”, ApJL, 611, L13 G, 2004.
- ¹⁰D. Farrah *et al*, “The X-Ray Spectrum of the $z = 6.30$ QSO SDSS J1030+0524” ApJL, 611, L13 G, 2004.
- ¹¹P. Galianni *et al*, “The discovery of a high red shift X-ray emitting QSO very close to the nucleus of NGC 7319 ”, ArXiv: astro-ph/0409215
- ¹²Becker *et al*, ArXiv: astro-ph/0108097

- ¹³R. Minchin *et al*, “A Dark Hydrogen Cloud in the Virgo Cluster”. ArXiv: astro-ph/0502312
- ¹⁴Goldhaber *et al*, “Observation of Cosmological Time Dilation using Type Ia Supernovae as Clocks”, arXiv: astro-ph/9602124.